

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 7 - 8, and 26 have been amended. Claim 35 has been added. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments or added claim, all of which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 2 - 6, 11 - 12, 15 - 19, 21 - 25, and 27 - 34 are cancelled from the application without prejudice. Applicants are not conceding in this application that the claims that were amended and the cancelled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the claim amendments and cancellations are directed toward facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the now-cancelled claims and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications. Claims 1, 7 - 10, 13 - 14, 20, 26, and 35 are now in the application.

### **I. Rejections under 35 U. S. C. §103(a)**

Paragraph 8 of the Office Action dated May 14, 2007 (hereinafter, “the Office Action”) states that Claims 1, 7 - 10, 13 - 15, 18 - 20, 26 - 27, 29 - 30, and 33 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent 6,300,947 B1 to Kanevsky in view of U. S. Patent 6,023,714 to Hill et al. (hereinafter, “Hill”) and further in view of U. S. Patent Publication 2003/0167334 A1 to Butler. Paragraph 9 of the Office Action states that Claims 31 - 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Hill and Butler, and further in view of U. S. Patent 6,463,440 B1 to Hind et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed with regard to the claims as currently presented.

Independent Claim 1, as currently presented, specifies:

A computer-implemented method of selecting among component-level versions of content for rendering at a client device, comprising steps of:  
receiving, at the client device from a server responsive to a request for a Web page, a markup language document corresponding to the requested Web page, wherein:  
the Web page comprises a displayable content component; and  
the markup language document comprises syntax specifying, for the displayable content component, at least three alternative selectable versions thereof and conditions for selecting each of the alternative selectable versions;  
evaluating, at the client device responsive to the receiving step, one or more factors to yield an evaluation result, wherein the one or more factors are determined from the specified conditions;  
using the evaluation result, at the client device, to select a particular one of the alternative selectable versions of the displayable content component from the syntax specifying the alternative selectable versions in the markup language document; and  
rendering the markup language document as the Web page on a display device coupled to the client device, wherein the selected version of the displayable content component is rendered as the displayable content component and each non-selected one of the versions of the displayable content component is omitted from the rendering of the markup language document. (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach, or suggest, (at least) the above-underlined limitations from independent Claim 1. Applicants find no teaching or suggestion in Kanevsky, for example, of “receiving, at the client device from a server ... a markup language document ... compris[ing] syntax specifying, for the displayable content component, at least three alternative selectable versions thereof and conditions for selecting each of the alternative selectable versions” (Claim 1, lines 3 - 9, emphasis added) or “using the evaluation result, at the client device, to select a particular one of the alternative selectable versions of the displayable content component from the syntax specifying the alternative

selectable versions in the markup language document” (Claim 1, lines 16 - 18, emphasis added).

Kanevsky describes examples of “folding” a Web page, and stripping objects and links out of a Web page, in col. 9, lines 35 - 39 for cases where “the user’s display size is smaller than the display size used for the web pages [that may be rendered on the user’s display]”. The “folding” is described as adapting a Web page to become “several pages” (col. 9, line 36). On the other hand, “if the user’s display size is larger than the web page design intended, [then] objects and links can be added to the web page” (col. 9, lines 39 - 41).

However, it is clear that this discussion in col. 9 of Kanevsky pertains to operations carried out at the server side of the network. This is in contrast to the client-side operations claimed in Applicants’ Claim 1, where each of the first three claim elements specifies “at the client device” (see Claim 1, lines 3, 13, and 16) and the fourth claim element specifies “on a display device coupled to the client device” (see Claim 1, lines 19 - 20). That is, the operations referred to in col. 9 of Kanevsky are carried out before the web page has been sent to the client, so that the client in Kanevsky receives a version that is already adapted for the client’s display – and therefore does not contain “syntax specifying at least three alternative selectable versions” (as claimed by Applicants in lines 7 - 9 of Claim 1).

The above-cited text in col. 9, lines 35 - 41 of Kanevsky refers to component **207**, a

“web page adaptation module”, as performing the folding and other operations. This component **207** is depicted in Kanevsky’s **FIG. 3**, and **FIG. 3** is described in col. 4, lines 17 - 18 as illustrating “... a web page adaptor server ...” (emphasis added). See also col. 7, lines 57 - 58, stating that **FIG. 3** illustrates “the web page server adaptor **107**” (emphasis added); by reference to **FIG. 1**, it can be seen that the “web page server adaptor **107**” is located on the server side of the network, being located between servers **104** and **114**.

A sample result of the “folding” described in col. 9, lines 35 - 39 is shown in **FIG. 7** (as stated in col. 4, lines 27 - 28 and col. 10, lines 36 - 37). However, col. 10, lines 40 - 44 refer to the “adaptation process” that creates the smaller web page **702** in **FIG. 7** from the larger web page **701** as being “performed by adaptor server **107**”. As noted above, adaptor server **107** operates on the server side of the network, in contrast to Applicants’ claimed client-side operations.

Applicants note that the Office Action cites text which includes col. 8, lines 13 - 15 of Kanevsky, where **FIG. 6** is discussed. However, this does not teach Applicants’ claimed approach, because the transformation shown in **FIG. 6** alters the syntax of the “original URL” from **500** when creating the “transformed URL” shown at **507**. That is, neither the URL syntax at **502** or the URL syntax at **503** is used as the resulting URL syntax at **508**. This altering of the input is different from Applicants’ claimed approach of “... select[ing] a particular one of the alternative selectable versions ... from the syntax ... in the markup

language document” (Claim 1, lines 16 - 18) and “rendering ... the Web page ... [with] the selected version ... rendered as the displayable content component ...” (Claim 1, lines 19 - 23).

The Office Action also cites Kanevsky’s **FIGS. 10 - 15**. However, as stated above, Applicants find no teaching, or any suggestion, in Kanevsky that a markup language document specifies “at least three selectable versions” of a displayable content component, in contrast to the limitations on lines 7 - 9 of Applicants’ Claim 1.

Page 4, lines 15 - 18 of the Office Action state that Kanevsky “fails to explicitly teach” receiving a markup language document “comprising conditions under which each of the [versions] should be selected ...”, “evaluating at the client device”, and “using the evaluation result at the client device”. Hill is then cited, making reference to col. 9, lines 9 - 67 and col. 11, lines 4 - 23. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Hill does not pertain to selecting a version of a displayable content component, and thus does not provide the teachings attributed thereto in the Office Action.

Instead, Hill describes formatting, or styling, the layout of document content by applying a style sheet. See, for example, lines 1 - 2 of Hill’s Abstract, stating “Dynamically adapting the layout of a document ...” and lines 6 - 11 of Hill’s Abstract, “... the layout generator selects a style sheet ... The style sheet assigns values to format properties ...”. See also lines 24 - 26 of the cited text from col. 9, stating “The layout generator ... selects a style sheet ...” and lines 50 - 54 of the cited text from col. 9, stating “Once the style sheet is selected

[by the layout generator], the client **20** uses the style sheet to render the document ... so that the format of the document content ... is adapted ...” (emphasis added). Lines 5 - 7 of the cited text from col. 11 state “... a layout generator ... selects a different style sheet ...”, and lines 7 - 9 state “Alternatively, ... a layout generator ... selects the same style sheet ...”.

Applicants respectfully submit that selecting a style sheet to vary the formatting of a document, as discussed by Hill, is patentably distinct from their claimed approach of selecting a version of a displayable content component (Claim 1, lines 16 - 18). See also col. 6, lines 49 - 53, where Hill states

A style sheet is a collection of style definitions which provides instructions for formatting a document. A style sheet *does not contain any document content*, only instructions for formatting document content. (emphasis added)

Page 5, lines 4 - 7 of the Office Action state that Kanevsky “fails to explicitly teach” “... syntax specifying a plurality of alternative selectable views of the component and conditions under which each of the views should be selected ...”. Butler is then cited, making reference to paragraphs [0009] - [0011] thereof. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the selections made by Butler are server-side processing, in contrast to the client-side operations specified in Claim 1. See para. [0021] of Butler, which describes a “detailed list of [the client’s] technical attributes”, known as a “profile”, which are transmitted from a client to a server when the client contacts the server and requests a web page (para. [0021], lines 1 - 5; see also para. [0011], lines 1 - 5). This transmission of the client profile is also illustrated in **FIG. 2** of Butler. Para. [0022] then describes how the server “processes the profile” (para.

[0022], lines 13 - 15; see also para. [0011], lines 5 - 6) and uses the information in the (server-side) “matching process” illustrated in **FIG. 3** (para. [0022], lines 33 - 43) to select an image usable by the requesting client. Notably, lines 45 - 46 of para. [0022] state “... meaning that the server **22** therefore dispatches the alternate image **12B** to the client device”. In other words, the client does not perform this selecting, because the server sends a web page with an already-selected image **12B**.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that any combination of the cited references of Kanevsky, Hill, and Butler (assuming, *arguendo*, that such combination could be made and that one of skill in the art would be motivated to attempt it) fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of their independent Claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore deemed patentable over the cited references. Independent Claims 26 and 35 specify analogous limitations, and are therefore deemed patentable over the references as well. Dependent Claims 7 - 10, 13 - 14, and 20 are deemed patentable by virtue of (*inter alia*) the allowability of the independent claim from which they depend.

The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejections of all claims as currently presented.

## II. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an

early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/ /#40,999/

Marcia L. Doubet  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168

Phone: 407-343-7586

Fax: 407-343-7587